1	MR. SNOOK: Okay.
2	CHAIRMAN GELSTON: That's all you have?
3	MR. SNOOK: And Mr. Williams, is this
4	your pre-filed testimony dated March 28, 2002?
5	MR. WILLIAMS: Yes, it is.
6	MR. SNOOK: Do you have any corrections
7	to this testimony?
8	MR. WILLIAMS: Yes, I do.
9	MR. SNOOK: And what would that be?
10	MR. WILLIAMS: Under Item 3 where it
11	says although nagations between the shellfish
12	interests, that should be negotiations.
13	MR. SNOOK: Do you have any other
14	corrections?
15	MR. WILLIAMS: No
16	MS. KATZ: Would you mind
17	CHAIRMAN GELSTON: Mr. Williams, if
18	you'd keep your voice up
19	MS. KATZ: Yeah.
20	CHAIRMAN GELSTON: we'd appreciate
21	it.
22	MR. WILLIAMS: No, no more corrections.
23	MR. SNOOK: Thank you. With that
24	correction is this, your pre-filed testimony, true and
	DOCE DEPONENC CERVICE

correct to the best of your knowledge and belief today 1 2 as of the day you filed it? 3 MR. WILLIAMS: Yes. 4 MR. SNOOK: I would therefore -- do you adopt this as your testimony today, Mr. Williams? 5 6 MR. WILLIAMS: Yes, I do. 7 MR. SNOOK: Under oath, Mr. Williams? 8 MR. WILLIAMS: Yes. 9 SNOOK: I would, therefore, offer MR. this as a full exhibit. 10 11 CHAIRMAN GELSTON: Any objection it being offered as a full exhibit? (No audible reply). 12 So entered in the record. 13 (Whereupon, Attorney General Blumenthal 14 Exhibit No. 1 was received into evidence as a full 15 exhibit. 16 17 CHAIRMAN GELSTON: You ready for crossexamination, Mr. Snook? 18 MR. SNOOK: Yes. I offer this witness 19 20 for cross-examination, Mr. Chairman. CHAIRMAN GELSTON: Mr. Fitzgerald. 21 22 MR. FITZGERALD: Thank you, Mr. Good morning, Mr. Williams. 23 Chairman.

POST REPORTING SERVICE HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

In your response to numbered Question 3,

you say that the consequences of the installation of the Iroquois pipeline were serious and wider in scope than anyone imagined. And then you go on to list two respects in which these impacts were wider than anticipated. The first thing you say is the installation barge exceeded the installation corridor by dropping its anchors well outside of it. What are you referring to there as the installation corridor?

MR. WILLIAMS: Mr. Fitzgerald, the installation corridor on the Iroquois project turned out to be a little bit confusing in that it turned out that apparently Iroquois negotiated --

MR. FITZGERALD: Mr. Williams --

MR. WILLIAMS: -- a construction corridor that was 300 feet wide with a subcontractor. However, a 200-foot wide corridor apparently was negotiated with the shellfish company.

MR. FITZGERALD: Alright, so -- so then the area that you are referring to here, whether it's 200 feet or 300 feet, as the corridor is the area approximate to the trench where the pipeline was being installed, either 100 or 200 feet on either side of the pipeline, is that right?

MR. WILLIAMS: Yes, I believe from the

1	centerline of the pipeline out
2	MR. FITZGERALD: Okay
3	MR. WILLIAMS: that's correct.
4	MR. FITZGERALD: and you say that it
5	was not anticipated that anchors would be dropped
6	outside of that corridor? Is that your testimony here?
7	MR. WILLIAMS: I'm not saying it was not
8	anticipating. I'm saying what's in the statement, that
9	the anchors were dropped outside of the construction
10	corridor.
11	MR. FITZGERALD: More than 100 or 200
12	and more than 200 feet from the vessel?
13	MR. WILLIAMS: That's correct.
14	MR. FITZGERALD: Okay. And have you
15	I'm sure you've reviewed the filings that are made
16	that have been made in this case. Do you have any
17	reason to believe that the anchor spread has not been
18	accurately shown on the documents that have been
19	submitted in this case?
20	MR. WILLIAMS: Your question is do I
21	have any reason to believe that the anchor spread is
22	not accurate?
23	MR. FITZGERALD: Yeah, have well, let
24	me ask you first of all, have you have you reviewed

	[1]
1	any documents filed in this case that show the anchor
2	spread that is anticipated for the construction
3	vessels?
4	MR. WILLIAMS: I have seen a document
5	somewhere in my paperwork here that apparently
6	described the anchor spread on the Islander East
7	project, yes.
8	MR. FITZGERALD: And did it show that
9	the anchor spread was more than a hundred feet from the
10	pipeline?
11	MR. WILLIAMS: Yes, it did.
12	MR. FITZGERALD: Okay. The on the
13	next page you talk about the turbidity related to the
14	installation of the Iroquois pipeline which was due in
15	part to the attempts to restore the bottom to
16	preconstruction profile?
17	MR. WILLIAMS: That's correct.
18	MR. FITZGERALD: Would you do you
19	know what those attempts consisted of?
20	MR. WILLIAMS: Yes, I do.
21	MR. FITZGERALD: Would you describe that
22	please?
23	MR. WILLIAMS: Yes. After the
24	installation of the pipeline and the backfilling of the

trench, we observed a tugboat with	a rather	large I-
beam that was employed for basically	y the smoot	thing out
of the topography of the area, to sm	mooth out	the high
spots in an attempt to, as I understa	and it base	ed on the
meetings that I attended, to bring t	the bottom	back to
preconstruction profile and to assist	t in filli	ng in any
voids in the trench as I understand	the operat	tion this
time.		
MR. FITZGERALD: This	s was a ve	ery large
steel beam that was being dragged acr	ross perpe	endicular

MR. FITZGERALD: This was a very large steel beam that was being dragged across perpendicular to the right-of-way by a tug and then being -- which would then make a turn and come back the other way and cross the right-of-way again --

MR. WILLIAMS: Roughly speaking, that's correct.

MR. FITZGERALD: And so given the size of the equipment, that tug and the beam affected the bottom for a distance that was considerably beyond the initially disturbed area, is that right?

MR. WILLIAMS: I would have a problem with that statement, sir.

MR. FITZGERALD: Well, it was the -- was the beam dragged over an area --

MR. TAIT: How long was the beam?

1

24

MR. WILLIAMS: I can only estimate length of the beam. 2 3 MR. TAIT: Would you try to do so? 4 MR. WILLIAMS: I would estimate it to be 5 between 30 and 40 feet long. 6 MR. FITZGERALD: And do you know whether or not that work was done because it was specified in 7 8 the permit condition? 9 MR. WILLIAMS: I wouldn't be able to 10 answer that. 11 MR. FITZGERALD: Okay. Would you suggest that permit conditions issued to Islander East 12 not include a specification for dragging a steel I-beam 13 14 back and forth across the trench area? 15 MR. WILLIAMS: Based on my experience 16 with the consequences of doing that, I would strongly 17 suggest against it. 18 MR. FITZGERALD: Okay. In the last 19 paragraph of your answer in response to Question 3, you 20 state that you observed holes and irregular features along the installation corridor on your video depth 21 22 sounder. And I'm sure you probably remember that for 23 part of its length the Iroquois pipeline was installed

> POST REPORTING SERVICE HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

using mechanical dredging and then for part of its

1	length it was installed using a hydraulic jet. Is that
2	consistent with your recollection?
3	MR. WILLIAMS: The jet part of it I
4	believe was done offshore and apparently it was done
5	outside of the area that I was involved with.
6	MR. FITZGERALD: Okay, so so your
7	your statements here are just referring to the in-shore
8	part of
9	MR. WILLIAMS: Yeah, my statements are
10	focused on what I would as a shell fisherman call the
11	600 lots which are east of Charles Island in Milford at
12	the time I had permission to be there.
13	MR. FITZGERALD: Now, do you know
14	whether or not a side-scan sonar survey of the entire
15	trench, including the near-shore area of the trench
16	through the shellfish beds, was ever done post-
17	construction?
18	MR. WILLIAMS: Sir, I believe so, yes.
19	MR. FITZGERALD: And have you reviewed
20	the information in that survey to see what it shows
21	about the contours of the bottom?
22	MR. WILLIAMS: The contours of the
23	bottom?
24	MR. FITZGERALD: Yeah. Well, I mean you
	DOCT PEROPETING CURVICED

	트로 그 가장 되고, 그는 이 회사회에서 되는 이번 그런 그 것이 마셨다고 있다. 그는 그를 가져왔다는 회원에 가장에 그는 그를 그리고 있다. 그는 그리고 그를 다 다른 그를 다 그 때문에 되었다.
1	you mentioned here that on your video depth sounder
2	you were able to see some holes and irregular features?
3	MR. WILLIAMS: Yes, that's correct.
4	MR. FITZGERALD: And these kinds of
5	features
6	MR. WILLIAMS: Okay
7	MR. FITZGERALD: would also be
8	MR. WILLIAMS: Yeah
9	MR. FITZGERALD: shown up on a sonar
10	survey taken for the purpose of identifying
11	MR. WILLIAMS: Yes
12	MR. FITZGERALD: what the bathymetry
13	was, wouldn't it
14	MR. WILLIAMS: Yes, that's correct.
	MR. FITZGERALD: And so I mean you've
15	Mr. FITZGERADD. And SO I mean you've
15 16	got some anecdotal observations here and I just I
	그 가이 그는 소리를 보면 있는데 모델레스 전체에 되었다.
16	got some anecdotal observations here and I just I
16 17	got some anecdotal observations here and I just I wondered whether you had reviewed the more
16 17 18	got some anecdotal observations here and I just I wondered whether you had reviewed the more MR. SNOOK: I object to the use of the
16 17 18 19	got some anecdotal observations here and I just I wondered whether you had reviewed the more MR. SNOOK: I object to the use of the
16 17 18 19 20	got some anecdotal observations here and I just I wondered whether you had reviewed the more MR. SNOOK: I object to the use of the term anecdotal. I believe they are actual observations
16 17 18 19 20 21	got some anecdotal observations here and I just I wondered whether you had reviewed the more MR. SNOOK: I object to the use of the term anecdotal. I believe they are actual observations MR. FITZGERALD: Well
16 17 18 19 20 21	got some anecdotal observations here and I just I wondered whether you had reviewed the more MR. SNOOK: I object to the use of the term anecdotal. I believe they are actual observations MR. FITZGERALD: Well MR. SNOOK: unless you're referring

contrast to systematic, but we don't need to argue about -- I'm -- the question is just whether you've reviewed the results of a post-construction side-scan sonar survey?

MR. WILLIAMS: Sir, the results, as I understand them, were presented to representatives of the shellfish industry along with other regulatory people at a meeting that I attended in early 1992. The results of the side-scan sonar was projected on a map and was provided to the meeting by company representatives.

MR. FITZGERALD: Okay -- well, I'm sure you're correct, but there is also on file with the Siting Council a survey filed on December 5th of 2000, have you seen that one?

MR. WILLIAMS: No.

MR. FITZGERALD: Okay.

MR. SNOOK: If the Council pleases, we have that map that Mr. Williams is discussing. I'm not sure the Council has asked for it or if the Applicant has. I have not offered it as an exhibit, but it is available.

MR. FITZGERALD: In response to numbered Question 4, you say in the second paragraph it appears

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

that few or no studies are being proposed by regulatory agencies to determine preconstruction conditions of habitat, organisms population, surveys of organisms which may be affected, post-construction conditions, mitigation, and long-term monitoring of the site. Would you suggest that if the Siting Council were to require a development and management plan with respect to this proposal that they include in it a condition requiring pre and post-construction surveys to characterize the habitat and benthic community populations in the area of the proposed construction?

MR. WILLIAMS: Yes, I would -- I would definitely recommend that. And from some of the testimony that I've heard and some of the information that I have read, apparently there are some efforts to I believe that, from what I've read and from do that. some of the testimony that I've heard, unfortunately a lot of the type of real science that goes into looking at these communities takes time. And personally as a shell fisherman, I'm aware of how long it takes to study the natural forces and the natural biology. that is my concern in that the process is accelerated and maybe a longer term approach to studying the effects should be considered.

MR. FITZGERALD: Thank you. I have no further questions.

CHAIRMAN GELSTON: Thank you. Rebecca Mars? (No audible reply). Branford Land Trust.

MR. HORNE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

For the record, William Horne for the Branford Land

Trust.

Mr. William, how would you characterize both the current and the potential commercial shellfish -- or current and potential value of the commercial shellfish habitat in the area delimited by Branford Harbor on the west, the Thimble Islands on the east, and North West Reef on the south?

MR. WILLIAMS: This particular area has been -- first of all from a historical standpoint, the Thimble Island area has been essential for an oystery fishery for over a hundred years. That's fairly well documented. There are a great many oyster beds in the immediate area that have been very important to the shellfish industry for quite some time as I said. Some of the ground is both used also for clams and oysters. Sometimes you can get two crops on one piece of ground, sometimes you get one or the other, but it is a very important area. It always has been and hopefully it

1	always	will	be
2			
2			

MR. HORNE: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN GELSTON: I believe Mr. Horne asked you what the financial impact was?

MR. HORNE: Well, I -- thank you, Mr. Chairman. I was -- I was not asking for a specific financial value. I was asking for an estimate of whether they were valuable beds or -- I think -- I think the Applicant in some of their filings have indicated that areas are not useful for shellfish and that -- I apologize if my question was inappropriately vague.

CHAIRMAN GELSTON: Valuable to -- (indiscernible) -- the amount of money.

MR. HORNE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I certainly would not object if Mr. Williams cared to offer an opinion on that, but counsel for the Applicant might object.

MR. FITZGERALD: I might. (Laughter).

CHAIRMAN GELSTON: Well, let's find out whether you might object.

MR. FITZGERALD: Well, I mean I don't -right now we don't have -- there's been no foundation
that would suggest that he is able to express an

opinion concerning the monetary value of resources that 1 are there or -- and so, therefore, I would object right 2 3 now --4 MR. TAIT: Mr. Horne, I think you've made your point with that question anyway. 5 MR. HORNE: Thank you, Mr. Tait. 6 7 CHAIRMAN GELSTON: Yeah but, Mr. Horne, before you go any farther, he just filed his income tax 8 9 on April 15th -- (laughter) -- and he should know how 10 much money he made --11 MR. FITZGERALD: But that --CHAIRMAN GELSTON: a shell 12 as 13 fisherman. that wasn't the 14 MR. FITZGERALD: But The -- and I don't -- I don't think anybody 15 wants to ask him that question. 16 17 MR. HORNE: It's my understanding that the Council could ask any question it wants at anytime. 18 Am I incorrect? 19 20 CHAIRMAN GELSTON: Mr. Snook, you have objections? 21 MR. SNOOK: Actually, no. The witness 22 is prepared to offer his evidence as to what in a sense 23

POST REPORTING SERVICE HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

the financial affect -- at least on some of his leases

that he has worked in this area have been.

CHAIRMAN GELSTON: Yes and then we'll get into the question how much it's going to affect -Islander East is going to affect it and we'll probably go far away from where we really want to go, so I will take Mr. Tait's advice and -- we found out what we wanted to know. (Laughter). Go ahead, Mr. Horne.

MR. HORNE: Thank you, Mr. Gelston. The Applicant has gone to some length to distinguish between active leases and undesignated lease areas in terms of where their activities will occur. Do you know of your own knowledge why the areas that are listed as undesignated lease areas are so listed?

MR. WILLIAMS: At the current time the undesignated areas north of the jurisdiction line within the Town of Branford jurisdiction are currently undesignated primarily because there was a number of years there where we didn't have too much of a rapport with the Shell Fish Commission and they really didn't know what to do with the ground. There were numerous applications and we went to meetings to lease a lot of this ground to cultivate the ground because we knew what the value was through traditional cultivation methods. All of it, all of it is extremely productive.

And that's -- there's really no reason why they should not have leased it. There was apparently one concern, as a shell fisherman and I have to validate this for the town, that they wanted to hold it for the use of the town's people, and I believe at the time -- or at the current time there's a program now through increased water quality monitoring to open up sections of the bottom to town people.

MR. SNOOK: Before I run afoul of having my witness provide evidence that is actually contradictory to a position of the Attorney General with respect to the Town of Greenwich's beaches -- (laughter) -- maybe we could move to the other areas -- A VOICE: (Indiscernible) -- I was

wondering --

A VOICE: I caught Mr. Snook's eye and he took -- he quickly got the hint.

(Overlap of voices, indiscernible).

MR. HORNE: Moving offshore, are there areas in the State lease that are undesignated or not leased? And if so, are there reasons why those are not leased?

MR. WILLIAMS: Currently, there's areas south of -- south of the jurisdiction line within State

jurisdiction that there is interest within the shellfish community to lease the bottom. the institute of -- well, at the implementation of the notice of this project, the State Shellfish Commissioner puts a ban on any future leasing to slow down any speculation in the area because that's apparently a concern. However, yes, there are -- there are resources out there that are of a concern to the shellfish industry as we speak.

MR. HORNE: Thank you. And not to put words in your mouth, but I would take it from your response is that you would bid on these beds if they were available for lease?

MR. WILLIAMS: Oh, absolutely.

Absolutely, yes. I've been out there before and -- in fact, I lost a bid on one piece of ground out there, and I'd certainly be active in bidding on it again.

MR. HORNE: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN GELSTON: (Indiscernible) -reasons or speculative reasons?

A VOICE: That was a question --

MR. WILLIAMS: Oh, it was --

A VOICE: Certainly.

MR. WILLIAMS: I will answer that, sir -

POST REPORTING SERVICE HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102



1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- with all due respect, that cuts to the heart of way I think about things, and -- and I will answer that question -- I believe that speculation in ground is the most abhorrent counterproductive, against the entire intent and spirit of the statutes and Connecticut's program for the management and the shellfish program over its public trust lands. And as a shell fisherman for over 30 years, I think it's the wrong thing to do. It's not shellfishing, it's speculation. of bottom for the cultivation these pieces ofWhen I got into this business, I was shellfish. brought up the hard way from the bottom up, and that's all I know. And I know there are people out there that would love to do that for reasons other than the cultivation of shellfish, and it's wrong. And that's the only way I can answer that, sir.

CHAIRMAN GELSTON: Thank you.

MR. HORNE: Based on your experience in Milford, what effect would anchor or spud holes have on the ability to cultivate shellfish beds?

MR. WILLIAMS: Anchors or spud holes or any type of depression in the bottom of cultivable shellfish beds represents a real obstacle. They represent an area that slowly fills in with apparently

fine grain material based on my experience. They also represent a hazard in that -- and again based on my experience, when one of our dredges drops into one of those holes, they're very often go to -- migrate to the other side because of travel of the boat, the dredge grabs the other side of the bottom of the hole and then everything goes tight, and in several instances I've actually parted the tow line to a clam dredge. So they represent obstacles that you have to avoid. And based on my experience, we've never been able to cultivate shellfish in these areas after they've been created.

MR. HORNE: During the construction of the Iroquois pipeline were there spoil mounds or berms of the type that have been described that would be constructed in Branford between mile post say 10.9 and 12?

MR. WILLIAMS: Yes, there were.

MR. HORNE: Were you -- did you observe an effect of storm action on the erosion of those berms?

MR. WILLIAMS: Yes, I did.

MR. HORNE: Could you tell us about what the effect was?

MR. WILLIAMS: The effect of some of the

POST REPORTING SERVICE HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102





weather events was a wider dispersal of the sediment plume that we had observed on a day-to-day basis during the construction process. In fact, it -- during a weather event from the east, we had quite a plume that went over the Charles Island bar to the west farther than we ever had experienced it before. So it -- there was quite a bit of dispersal during the weather events.

MR. HORNE: Thank you. One last question. Is it possible for commercial shellfishing to occur in the area that was disturbed by the 1991 Iroquois construction?

MR. WILLIAMS: Up until the time in 1995 that I was a subcontractor to Tallmadge Brothers, the scarred area from the Iroquois installation was not cultivable. And we tried.

After 1995 there was some undesignated ground to the south that some leases had come up for bid that I had tried the bottom -- and this was after '95, I can't be specific on -- but again you could always tell when you got near the scar from the pipeline, there was -- there just wasn't anything there to speak of. And we had a lot of trouble fishing the dredges on that outer portion. So to answer your question, the simple answer is no.

-		MR. HORNE: Thank you. I have no
2	further que	estions, Mr. Gelston.
3		CHAIRMAN GELSTON: Thank you. The Town
4	of Guilfor	rd. (No audible reply). The Town of
5	Branford?	
6		MS. GILSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
7	For the rec	ord, Elizabeth Gilson, the Town of Branford.
8	Good morni	ng, Mr. Williams. I have a couple of
9	questions.	Mr. Horne took many, so I'll try to be
10	efficient h	mere.
11		You testified you've reviewed the
12	Islander Ea	st application, isn't that correct?
13		MR. WILLIAMS: The application I have,
14	yes.	
15		MS. GILSON: And you testified regarding
16	the anchor	scars and cables. I have a couple of
17	questions t	o follow up. How big is the anchor hole, do
18	you know?	
19		MR. WILLIAMS: Well
20		MR. TAIT: That depends upon the size of
21	the anchor?	
22		MS. GILSON: Right, and that's why
23	the well	, their anchors specified
24		A VOICE: (Indiscernible) testifying,
		POST REPORTING SERVICE

HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

1 Mr. Tait? 2 MR. TAIT: No, I'm asking what size was 3 the anchor that you're talking about? 4 MS. GILSON: The anchor sizes are specified, I believe, in the application. 5 MR. TAIT: Refresh my recollection. 6 7 MS. GILSON: I -- maybe the witness can do better. 8 9 WILLIAMS: The size of the anchors MR. 10 specifically I can't say. I saw them, they're quite 11 large, however -- could you repeat the question again. MS. GILSON: Well, I wanted to know how 12 13 big a hole was --MR. WILLIAMS: Okay, yeah --14 15 MS. GILSON: -- suppose to be --MR. WILLIAMS: Yeah, I don't know how 16 big the holes are suppose to be, but I know based on --17 well again on-site experience with my boat and also 18 19 based on the map that was provided at the meeting that 20 I attended, that the -- some of the holes were actually 21 quite large and in --MR. TAIT: Can you quantify that? 22 MR. WILLIAMS: Quantify? 23

POST REPORTING SERVICE HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

MR. TAIT: How many feet --

1	MR. WILLIAMS: Yes. With all due
2	MR. TAIT: quite large means?
3	MR. WILLIAMS: With all due respect, to
4	put this in perspective, some of the anchor scarring
5	with the Iroquois project were actually over 500 feet
6	long.
7	MR. TAIT: And how wide or just a
8	drag scar
9	MR. WILLIAMS: That was a drag scar.
LO	MR. TAIT: How wide?
۱1	MR. WILLIAMS: I don't know how wide
L2	they would be, sir. I
L3	MR. TAIT: One foot, two foot, three
۱4	feet
L5	MR. WILLIAMS: No, no, no, no. They
.6	would probably be in the magnitude of uh I would
.7	I would say, as accurate as I can, probably seven to
L8	eight feet that I could see on my sounder. It was
.9	some of them were fairly sharp and then up again fairly
20	rapidly, and
21	MR. TAIT: How deep would they go?
22	MR. WILLIAMS: I saw on one of the lots
23	one that was six feet deep.
24	MR. TAIT: So six feet by eight feet by
	[]

1	
2	MR. WILLIAMS: By length.
3	MR. TAIT: By whatever length you
4	MR. WILLIAMS: Yeah.
5	MS. GILSON: Of course we know from the
6	last hearing that it's five foot four feet, but go on.
7	MR. WILLIAMS: Okay
8	MS. GILSON: But six feet
9	MR. PHILIP ASHTON: When did you see
10	these scars?
11	MR. WILLIAMS: Excuse me?
12	MR. ASHTON: When did you see these
13	I'm sorry, I apologize for being late.
14	MR. WILLIAMS: That's okay. On the
15	on the on the Iroquois project it was it would
16	have been the fall of '91 after they had finished
17	MR. ASHTON: Right after the project was
18	complete?
19	MR. WILLIAMS: Yeah.
20	MR. ASHTON: Okay.
21	MS. GILSON: And you testified about the
22	problems with the holes, but does that mean you would
23	avoid the holes by a certain distance or can you just
24	avoid fishing in the holes or dropping your dredge in

around the holes themselves?

MR. WILLIAMS: Yeah, it -- from a fishing standpoint -- there's a couple of things to qualify my answer to that. It depends on the current regime and the topography of the bottom and how you're positioning the boat for dredging. But that being said, you have to give them a little bit of a leeway. If you know the run of them and where they are, you can buoy them off and give them a little bit of respect with the dredging process. So you have -- you have a buffer zone near the holes that you also kind of don't want to go near --

MS. GILSON: And --

MR. WILLIAMS: -- but you know, the zone would probably be -- depending on the run and the current regime, it could be as close as 10 feet --

MS. GILSON: On either side of the hole?

MR. WILLIAMS: On either side of the hole. After 10 feet -- you know, 10 feet on the water is nothing, I mean it's -- it's a hair width, so.

MS. GILSON: Okay. Do you know if the anchor holes are going to be uniformally spaced in the Islander East project?

MR. WILLIAMS: No, I -- I don't know

POST REPORTING SERVICE HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

that, no.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MS. GILSON: Would it help if they were evenly spaced in avoiding these holes?

MR. WILLIAMS: Well -- if -- if the holes were mapped with GPS coordinate geometry and, you know, sonar mapping was furnished, yeah, it would be helpful. That would be helpful to actually locate the features on the bottom.

MS. GILSON: Okay. You testified briefly about the undesignated beds in Branford. Could you tell me why those beds are important?

MR. WILLIAMS: The entire region produces shellfish. There are existing deeded pieces of ground in Branford and leases south of the jurisdiction line. The undesignated ground is -- what it represents to a shell fisherman is areas that if you employ traditional cultivation methods, you have a tendency to increase the amount of recruitment in the This is one of the fundamental practices that area. we've done for so long in this industry. And a lot of people think well we transplant clams or we just go in and we harvest and we just take them out. Well part of that cultivation process through reasons that kind of escape me, I've seen it time and time again over the